DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 379 HE 019 898

AUTHOR Toombs, William; Lindsay, Carl A.
TITLE Departments and Professions: Institutionalizing Continuing Professional Education.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; Decision Making; Department Heads; *Departments; *Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Needs Assessment; *Professional Associations; *Professional Continuing Education; Program Administration; School Business Relationship; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The value of developing continuing professional education (CPE) programs at the department or program level was assessed at Pennsylvania State University. Four issues were explored: (1) the relationships between departments and traditional and emerging professions; (2) the degree of correspondence between the values and behaviors of department heads and faculty, especially on behaviors associated with CPE; (3) the appropriate locus of responsibility required by CPE; and (4) types of decisions made at the department level and how CPE may best be introduced. Information was collected from 33 departments, divisions, or sections through a background summary, pre-interview survey, and interview with the department head. It was found that departments are generally experienced with the kinds of activities required by a CPE program for professionals. The most usual avenue of departmental involvement with the profession was continuing education programs. Another valuable link with professions was through memberships in associations that includes practitioners. Both faculty and department heads thought that relationships with practitioners in research, scholarship, and publication were important. External public actions, such as recertification requirements, mandatory CPE, or sanctions were seen as the strongest stimulus for university involvement in CPE. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276379

DEPARTMENTS AND PROFESSIONS:

Institutionalizing Continuing Professional Education

William Toombs

and

Carl A. Lindsay

With the assistance of:

Carol McCart
Karen Constantine
Jeffrey Gilmore

For

AERA, Division J, Meeting
San Francisco, CA, April 1986

CPE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The Pennsylvania State University
March 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Toombs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 019 898

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Departments and Professions:

Institutionalizing Continuing Professional Education

I. THE SETTING

This study is rooted in the premise that a strong intellectual affinity, potential and actual, exists between the established professional and the university. To such a natural or at least logical partnership, the university brings a capacity to generate and organize knowledge along with a tradition of broad learning and contemplation. Practitioners bring the power, granted as a public trust, to legitimize procedures and review competence. With their organizations also resides a sense of the priority among practical issues and control of the delivery system by which professional services are made available to clients. Worthy though the relationship between university and established practitioner may be, we still have not achieved exactly the right vehicles, programmatic and organizational, to bring the complementary and interacting interests into a continuous relationship.

The association of the two interests at the preparatory level is well established, and has been since the migration to university campuses of law and medical schools (Starr, 1983) in the first two decades of this century. The situation with respect to mature practitioners is quite different and the universities come late to a situation in Continuing Professional Education (CPE) which is rich in the variety of purveyors and methods of delivery. Stern (1983) sums the general circumstance quite well:

> "CPE as a growth industry in its early stages has had a sprawling vitality which defies conventional classification. The larger, ever-growing population requires there be more professionals in existing fields; meantime the new service-oriented technology creates new professions."

This report is part of a larger effort to bring the complementary interests of mature practitioners and university faculty into collaboration. The Continuing Professional Education (CPE) Development Project at The Pennsylvania State University joined the interest of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation in the improvement of practice and the University's considerable experience in continuing education to seek the most beneficial modes of exchange between professors and professionals. The project engaged the University and five established professions in a collaborative approach to the construction and delivery of continuing professional education programs that better reflect the needs of practice (Smutz, et al., 1981; Lindsay, et al., 1982). As Houle observed, "The idea of CPE is certainly an old one and had a long first era." Penn State is very much a part of that era and has offered short-cycle programs of learning to practitioners for decades.

One of the principal lines of inquiry for the project has been how continuing professional education can be "institutionalized" at or near the academic core. The three typical methods for establishing a function in the academic structure are by:

(1) Creating a separate organizational unit, a division, school, or institution. Clark (1958) analyzed the limitations of that approach in a landmark article on adult education.

(2) Incorporating the activity into the faculty role pattern. Sponsored project research in the Post World War II era provides the best example.

(3) Modifying departmental activities to make a place for the activity. The growth in governance responsibilities absorbed by departments illustrates this approach.

Our research has already examined the feasibility of institutionalizing CPE at the academic core by incorporating it into the normal faculty role (Toombs, et al., 1985). The results suggest that CPE is acceptable only to the degree that it fits with well-established values. That strong value pattern, just about monolithic in most universities, puts the acquisition and maintenance

of expert knowledge in a primary position and relegates service, instruction, and application to lesser positions. On the question of what kind of performance can be used as evidence of expertise, there is break out into four subcultural sectors within the faculty, a condition that stands as an obstacle to this mode of institutionalization. The organizational side has not been neglected and the work of Smutz (1984) examined quite fully the boundary-spanning roles generated in the course of the CPE Development project.

In the pages that follow, it is the departmental route that is examined, how various departmental relationships with professions and semi-professions (Etzioni, 1969) might become the base for a comprehensive program of continuing professional education.

Accordingly, the questions pursued by this study are:

1. What kinds of relationships do departments now hold with traditional and emerging professions?
2. To what degree do the perceptions of values and behaviors between chairs and faculty correspond, especially on behaviors associated with CPE?
3. What is the most appropriate locus of responsibility required by Continuing Professional Education?
4. If the department is the appropriate locus for CPE, what is needed to carry out the functions?

At the outset it must be noted that any relationship between university departments and mature practitioners faces many obstacles and few precedents. Houle (1983) in a consideration of possible futures points out that CPE has some of the stigma of "remedial" education. Frandson (1983) called attention to the broad scope of cooperation the university might have to achieve with a variety of planners and providers in order to participate in this market. There are philosophical and conceptual issues as to how and, indeed, whether CPE fits into adult education as the university conceives it or stands more firmly on the determinations of the profession (Apps, 1985; Woll, 1984).

Berlin (1983) has identified sharply some of the issues surrounding university participation in CPE. There is from the start, "... tension between the university's central purposes and continuing education's peripheral role..." Persistent too is the "marginality" of enterprises in the university that serve adults. Even in the professional school "... the continuing education operation is no closer to the core activities of the school than is a general university-wide extension." The current climate of questioning the nature of university role also forces a "reversion to type," a consolidation around the most defensible part of tradition. There is, too, a distance between the world of learning and the world of practice. In short, however compelling the logic may be, the path and outcomes of CPE for the university are not automatic. They must be constructed by analysis, experimentation, and collaboration.

A prefatory note on departments is needed. One strain of the literature about departments is concerned with how the institution can regain control of the directions taken by faculty in the disciplinary setting. The extensive work of Dressel and his associates in the early seventies (Dressel, 1971, 1972) moved from the premise that "... the department or the dominant personalities in it have become arrogant and lost the vision of service, which must be a central characteristic of any profession. Reform and realignment of priorities are needed." The conclusion was that by selective resource allocation institutional leadership could bring departments back into line.

Much has happened in fifteen years and the premise of this study is that the cues and contacts of departments and faculty provide to university leadership a basis for policy, particularly when an exchange with the external environment is involved. Admittedly the attention here is on one kind of department, those with a professional connection. The full nature of that

distinction is laid out by Smart and Elton (1976) using Biglow's classification which places most of our subjects in the "hard-applied-life (and non-life)" category. Peterson (1976) has pointed out that the pure disciplinary departments of the late nineteenth century have been increased by the addition of other types of units. These reflect a different "epistemology" and constitute "professional departments." From our conversation with department chairs it is clear that, first, the distinctions based on field are very significant and, second, there is now, in contrast with 1970, a disposition to frame the department activity to the university's stated mission.

II. PROCEDURES

The collection process was simple in design, but detailed in execution in order to capture as accurately as possible the relationships between departments and professions. These relationships have grown up by tradition and personal interest rather than as an expression of formal policy.

At any complex, modern university, the nature of program units is far, more involved than a simple list of disciplines (Peterson, 1976). For this study, 35 program units, that is, departments, divisions, or sections, were selected from approximately 150. These units reported in an earlier inventory study that they recognized some ties with a particular professional or semi-professional area (Queeney; Hanniford, 1984). Five were only generally related to a group of professions--biochemistry with health fields, for example. Eight saw their work as contributing directly to professional preparation, and 22 actually prepared people for certification. Cooperation came from 33 of the 35, and complete tabulations are available for the cases.

The collection process involved a background summary, a pre-interview survey, and a semi-structure interview (with the department chair) by two research team members. The background document covered some personal factors about the incumbent chair, length of time in the positions, and length of time at the University. Also noted were orientations of the department, which professions were served and in what way, how much previous CPE programming had been carried out, and whether CPE was perceived as part of the mission of the department.

The pre-interview survey in three parts asked first for a rating of importance on a set of behaviors, 27 of the 34 previously presented to our faculty sample. Some items were part of the traditional professorial role set, others were quite specific to CPE. The obvious objective is to see how

congruent faculty and leadership evaluations might be using simple correlation.

A second section laid out some of the necessary functions associated with CPE, initiative, liaison, sponsorship, design, and conducting programs. Respondents were asked for the most appropriate location for such activity. The final sections asked for a perception of the scope of control and decision making in the department.

The interview itself aimed at refining information on the priorities of the department and the relative position of CPE in those priorities. Needs for dealing actively with CPE were also discussed.

All these queries rest on a group of assumptions drawn from previous studies of continuing education and departmental operation. For example, department chairs with previous involvement with CE or CPE have more favorable attitudes than those without such experience. Similarly, the expectation is that responsibility for CPE should be at the department level will generate a more pro-active position. Departments with a great deal of contact with professional bodies will anticipate the need for CPE links with mature practitioners more clearly than those separated from the profession.

The analysis is essentially qualitative and descriptive using content analysis of interview protocols to expand the factual items gathered by the survey.

III. FINDINGS

A. Background

The personal experience of the chairs in these 33 departments is substantial. The average tenure as chair is 5.5 years, and the mean time with the University is 14.2 years. A large number, 25 out of 33, have had the direct experience of teaching continuing education programs. Twenty-two departments have regular contact with practitioners. We can say that the respondents know the University, know about continuing education, and are in touch with the practitioners' world--all factors that contribute to the credibility of their responses.

Turning to the descriptive material on the units, we note that, although our sample came from a catalogue or inventory of all departments that reported ties with professions a few years earlier, only 26 of our 33 respondents now acknowledge a relationship to a profession. We may infer that how departments relate to professions may not be self-evident or permanent, but reflects a shifting pattern of influence and interests. Anderson (1976) has noted this "considerable ambiguity" in relationships with extra-departmental bodies.

What kinds of relationships do departments now hold with traditional and emerging professions?

The link between departments and professions is not always a one-on-one association. Of the 26 departments with acknowledged ties to professions, half (13) identified liaison with more than one field of practice. The nature of the department role with respect to the profession is most often through the knowledge and skill base, 22 out of 26, rather than direct preparation for license or certification.

When the kinds of activities that sustain direct association with the profession are tabulated (Table 1), we find wide variety and a high level of engagement. The most usual avenue of departmental involvement is through Penn

TABLE 1

Departments and Professions: Kinds of Involvement

	Involvement	N
1.	Offers instruction to practitioners through continuing education system	24
2.	Has faculty members who hold membership in an organization that includes some practitioners	23
3.	Provides consulting services to practitioners' organization(s) or individual members	22
4.	Maintains a continuous liaison with professional practitioners	22
5.	Has faculty members who hold membership in an organization composed mostly of practitioners	21
6.	Works with practitioners to identify and resolve problems of interest to practitioners	20
7.	Collaborates with professional organizations or groups to design continuing professional education activities	18
8.	Offers instruction to practitioners in settings outside of University-sponsored courses or programs	16
9.	Provides faculty to sit on a licensing or certifying body	12
10.	Other (please specify) _____	2

State's continuing education programs; 24 of the 26 report this. A subsequent question pinpoints this more sharply, and 28 out of the total sample of 33 have contributed to a continuing education workshop, conference, or short course, not necessarily for a profession, however. There is also a high level of involvement with correspondence courses, again not for the professional bodies, but on individual option. The point to be noted here is that departments are generally experienced with the kind of activities a program for professionals will require.

Another valuable link with professions is through memberships in associations that count practitioners as well as academics in their group; 22 out of 26 departments report it. Not common is participation in a licensing or certifying board: Only 12 departments have such a relationship. Departments see their level of activity in continuing education as moderate, rating it 2.6 on a 4.0 point scale. It is more "important," than frequent, nevertheless, shown by a mean rating of 3.0 out of 4.0.

To what degree do the perceptions of values and behaviors between chairs and faculty correspond, especially on behaviors associated with CPE?

Using a five-point scale of "importance" department chairs rated 27 behavioral items, some representing regular academic values and others reflecting CPE requirements (Table 2). The correlations between faculty ratings previously gathered from 135 responents in a study last year and department chair ratings are high: $r = .77$ on the behaviors associated with instruction and learning; $r = .86$ for research and scholarship; and $r = .93$ on those dealing with dissemination and publication. If only those behaviors related to CPE are examined, the correlation on instruction and teaching rises to $r = .97$. What differences there are reflect the somewhat greater emphasis by department chairs on undergraduate teacing and certain graduate involve-

TABLE 2

Importance of Activities: Faculty vs. Department Chairs

Faculty Rank on Items	Faculty Score	Department Head Rank	Department Head Score
Instruction and Learning	A		B
1. Offer instruction to advanced undergraduates in specilization	3.91	1	4.25
2. Participate in workshops for professionals*	3.53	2	3.72
3. Develop new undergraduate curriculum for program	3.36	3	3.72
4. Offer instruction to professional practitioners for credit*	3.30	7	3.31
5. Participate in evaluation of education programs for professional groups	3.17	8	3.26
6. Work on team to design course of study for practitioners*	3.16	9	3.25
7. Service on doctoral committee in related field	3.12	4	3.65
8. Design or teach interdisciplinary course to undergraduates	3.09	11	2.94
9. Offer instruction as tutor or leader to professional practitioners*	3.03	10	3.09
10. Develop independent study for undergraduates	3.00	5	3.63
11. Work on curriculum change for doctoral program	2.83	6	3.62
12. Prepare study materials for practitioners*	2.84	12	2.62
13. Offer instruction to part-time adults at undergraduate level	2.75	13	2.53
A:B Correlation		r = .77	
Research and Scholarship			
1. Present current research to practitioners*	3.98	2	3.90
2. Conduct joint research with other universities	3.74	3	3.88
3. Study a theoretical issue of importance to practitioners*	3.73	1	4.12
4. Work with practitioner on a practical problem*	3.68	4	3.84
5. Design research to improve practice*	3.47	5	3.72
6. Prepare grant proposal for analysis of practice*	3.00	7	3.12
7. Conduct research on teaching in specialized fields	2.98	6	3.47
A:B Correlation		r = .86	

TABLE 2

Importance of Activities: Faculty vs. Department Chairs
(continued)

Faculty Rank on Items	Faculty Score	Department Head Rank	Department Head Score
Dissemination and Publications	A		B
1. Publication in respected journal	4.41	1	4.84
2. Publish article on practical implications of one's work	3.97	5	3.71
3. Joint publication on theory/practice with practitioner*	3.86	2	3.94
4. Publication in journal for practitioners*	3.82	4	3.78
5. Present paper at national conference for practitioners*	3.77	3	3.91
6. Publication of research in popular periodical	3.52	6	3.41
7. Act as consulting editor of practitioners' journal*	3.50	-	--
A:B Correlation		4 = .93	

* CPE-Related Item

ments, a factor that is made clearer by the interview data. The conclusion from the comparison of faculty and department chair evaluations of behavior items is that there is substantial similarly in their views. Both see the relationships with practitioners as they develop around research, scholarshp, and publication as important. Affiliations around the teaching-learning function are rated much lower.

Of significance in any attempt to develop effective and varied CPE programs is the latent tendency of academics to perceive all education as "teaching a course." The components of learning and teaching are not differentiated so the idea of preparing study materials for someone else to use in either self-study or teaching is not rated high. As Houle (1981) points out, the "goals of the professionalization process cannot be achieved by a wholly autonomous approach." That, however, is how faculty perceive their instructional work.

In research and scholarship the only variation is a slightly higher evaluation by chairs of "theory in the service of practice." This carries over to the publication evaluation with chairs rating "practical implications" lower than faculty. Throughout, however, it is the aggrement on role items that comes through.

The questions of whether departments are aware of the potential benefits of affiliations with practitioners on CPE and what those benefits might be were covered in the interviews. Of the 33 chairs interviewed, 26 reported a degree of benefit awareness among faculty in the department. The benefit from association with CPE most often mentioned was "leads" for research and funding. When related responses were added, 25 departments saw aids to faculty self-development, not service in any form, as the main line of benefit.

What is the most appropriate locus of responsibility for the activities required by Continuing Professional Education?

In the pre-interview survey, the idea of CPE was presented as a possible new facet of department activity. This was necessary because, even though Penn State has extensive experience with short-cycle courses for practitioners, the fully articulated program characterized by continuous relationships between practitioners and professions, the heart of CPE, has not yet appeared. Functions specific to CPE were stipulated as "initiating discussions" with professional bodies, "maintaining liaison" with them, "sponsoring joint teams", "designing learning materials", and "conducting programs."

In answer to a direct question as to whether there was a possibility of developing a CPE approach, 25 of the 33 said "yes." When presented with the question of where the main activities of CPE should be located, the response was, consistently, "at the department level." Only the sponsorship of programs was seen as the college responsibility, although cooperation with the college was viewed as important in the initial stage and in actually running programs. This strong opinion of department chairs about where the functions of CPE should be located is matched by faculty views gathered in a previous study.

If the department is the appropriate locus for CPE, what is needed to carry out the functions?

Analysts of departmental operations give considerable attention to decision making style and priorities along with other features such as internal communication and organizational structure (Anderson, 1976; Smart & Elton, 1976; Peterson, 1976). The dictum of Dressel (1971) is succinct, "Departments develop their own priorities and modes of operation to pursue them."

TABLE 3

Department Chairs: Appropriate Locus of Responsibility for CPE

	Missing Values	Interested Faculty Members	Department	Dean of the College	Special Office for CPE in the College	Special Univ. CPE Ctrs.	Existing Continuing Education Offices	Total Cases
Initiating Discussions (LINIT)	3	10	11	0	4	4	3	35
Maintaining Liaison (LMAINT)	4	13	12	0	2	3	1	35
Sponsoring Joint Professor/Professional Teams (LSPONSOR)	5	6	7	4	6	6	1	35
Designing Learning Materials (LDESIGN)	5	15	9	0	0	5	1	35
Conducting Programs (LCONDUCT)	5	11	13	0	1	1	4	35

The decision-making style of the department, particularly if there is wide variation among the units, would have a bearing on how CPE may best be introduced. Given four choices, the participatory mode with the chair initiating and the group endorsing action prevailed in 31 out of 33 cases. Only 4 chairs reported a concentration of responsibility and decision on the chair alone. At the other end of the spectrum, only 14 saw the initiative in the hands of individuals with the chair as a coordinator. Multiple selections could be made even though they result in some ambiguity.

TABLE 4

Prevailing Decision Style in the Department

Decision Style	N
1. The initiative lies with the chair, but there is usually a group review and coordinated group action	31
2. Responsibility for initiative and action is delegated to particular individuals or chairs in the department	17
3. Initiative comes from individual members and the chair acts to coordinate actions	14
4. The initiative for decisions and the responsibility for action lies primarily with the department chair	4

This small sample of departments reflects a somewhat different style than the "dominant chair" pattern so often reported in the studies of the 1968-73 era. The implicit question of whether departments have become more collegial in recent years is worthy of analysis.

Priorities for the department, another key factor, were explored in the interviews. When asked about the "highest priorities" for the department,

three objectives appeared most frequently: graduate instruction (26 respondents), scholarship and research (22 respondents), and undergraduate instruction (21 respondents). Of the 33 departments 28 mentioned at least one, 24 departments picked two of them, and 16 departments identified with all three. Answers that reflected continuing education either in the context of service, outreach, or involvement with professions were relatively few, only 14 reporting such activity in their priority set. There is a prevalent view somewhat shaped by the traditional practice of treating continuing education as extra-load; extra-compensation that CPE is an individual faculty matter, not department policy. The cross-circuits generated by a heavy commitment to undergraduate education in the departments and the pressure of the preferred values of research and graduate study on faculty are very evident when we compare the faculty study data with the departmental views.

Chairs were then asked about the "possibility of higher priority for CPE." A sizable majority of departments believe they already have CPE among their priorities, 22 in all, but the position is generally seen as low and stable. Only 7 said it was "high" on the list and another 4 were trying to develop the idea. The "stand pat" group were looking for some external stimulus such as funding (3), change in reward system (4), or interdepartmental agreements. Most chairs, 27 out of 33, are willing to explore new contacts with professional bodies but 10 thought the initiative resided with the professional practitioners or with mandated CPE.

Two questions, one in the survey and the other in the interview, were, flat out, invitations to offer a "wish list" of resources. The responses were surprisingly moderate and well considered. The resources needed are a small amount of faculty time, on the order of 0.5 FTE, and enough funds for the direct expenses. Introducing CPE is not simply a matter of enlarging the departmental budget.

If departments are an appropriate place to develop joint programs with professions, then the chairs should feel that they have an appropriate scope of control. On budget decisions and reallocations, the control is perceived as below the level of adequacy. This is so also with rewards. Planning and adjusting the departmental mission are perceived to be above the adequacy level, and communication within the college is seen as most adequate. The participation of chairs in budget decisions would have to be increased to sustain CPE efforts. It raises some interesting management issues for the colleges. Nevertheless, the department chairs do perceive themselves as having sufficient control of decisions at least to get the investigation of CPE started.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The department or program is the most promising location for the development of Continuing Professional Education Programs. In terms of experience with continuing education, understanding lines of contact with professions, acknowledgement of the benefits, and acceptance of the idea, department chairs present a good starting point. The benefits to research and publication are well understood and highly valued by both faculty members and department chairs. On the average, about one-half of the faculty in these fields are attuned to the development of some kind of work with practitioners. External public actions, such as recertification requirements, mandatory continuing professional education, or sanctions are seen as the strongest stimulus for university involvement in CPE. There is a recognition that this, CPE delivey, is a very competitive field. Questions as to whether the University is prepared to move into this environment came up frequently.

At the same time development of a full CPE relationship, constructing and deliversing practice-based learning activities, is not a simple matter and it must be recognized that only the rudiments are present.

There are a number of limitations and obstacles that cannot be addressed by the departments themselves. More autonomy in budget management, some evidence of college and university recognition of the value of CPE, and a modest amount of "slack" resources would help. Those who have worked with CPE programs can discern some other obstacles to be overcome. A better appeciation for the components of learning, instruction, and delivery is needed. Acceptance of a role as a co-equal with other non-academic experts will have to be cultivated. A formidable obstacle lies in the wide variation across the University on what professions are. "Professions" are often vaguely defined. Few have well-organized central

offices. Some departments identify links to as many as half a dozen separate professional bodies. The variation goes on to include items like public licensing issues, interprofessional relations, and competition with other delivery systems.

Putting all these factors together suggests a line of approach to CPE that respects the interests and initiatives of the department, but allows some of the issues to be addressed on a university-wide basis, the creation of a coordinating, consulting, communicating unit that can work with departments to develop their leads at whatever level they may exist. Such a unit, the Office of Continuing Professional Education, is in its first year of operation at Penn State.

Early in this study we believed that the Executive Development programs for business leaders so prevalent on university campuses represented a prototype for all CPE. Now it is clear that there is no one ideal format. Each department/profession combination will have to construct, step by step, its own CPE relationship. The Executive Development Programs are very attractive because all the required components fit nicely into place. There is unambiguous motivation for employee participants, for the sponsoring firm, for faculty, department, and college. Legitimacy of the enterprise is assured and resources come relatively easy because price is linked to prestige. In other fields, however, the patterns are unclear, even unexamined. What is likely to emerge from a persistent effort toward CPE at the deparment level is a rich collection of innovative program designs.

At this time there are few prototypical programs of continuing professional education that use academic resources to the fullest extent. From the experience of the CPE Development project at Penn State and the research studies associated with the effort it is possible to construct the first draft

of a checklist that might be used to determine whether the essential components for CPE development are present in prospect.

The conditions to be assessed, (not simply checked "yes" or "no",) might include:

1. READINESS

   a. Department -- Aware of the dimensions of the profession, Able to identify needs and realistically view academic role, understands "education" as a differentiated set of activities.

   b. Profession -- Coherent organization exists. Area of generic practice is clear. CPE fits into a category of valued activity. Aware of a need for improvement of practice.

2. LEGITIMACY

   Professional association is prepared to endorse or collaborate on CPE efforts. Activity can be fitted into mission of department. Some method of acknowledging or recognizing participation in CPE exisits or can be developed. Public or consumer groups are prepared to support, approve, or recognize CPE activity.

3. MOTIVATION

   Careful assessment of motivation, the most complex of these topics, as it exists or can be developed in each of the constituencies, is important. Employers or organizations in which practice is conducted, individual practitioners, the professional membership organizations, public authorizing bodies--all must see a "stake," large or small, in the CPE idea. In the university, not only departmental leadership and participant faculty, but also college-level leaders and academic peer groups, must find the motivations legitimate and consistent with the academic ethos.

4. RESOURCES

   The first level of resources is neither money not personnel, but lines of communication and personal involvement. From this rootstock, a climate of understanding and trust is developed between professionals and professors. Only when a state of mutual appreciation and integrity is reached can a next step be contemplated. What is called for here is a "risk investment," carefully sequenced and evaluated, that will not yield a short-term return and may be lost.

   Tangible resources must be assessed in terms of market factors; a real demand, capacity to pay, awareness of need, perception of value. This is particularly critical because only a limited set of practice conditions can be dealt with at any one time and they must be those with the highest potential for success.

5. SPONSORSHIP

The CPE endeavor at al stages requires clear endorsement and sponsorship of both a formal and symbolic nature. Individual faculty "champions," professionals who take "boundary spanning" roles, leaders who offer a public stance of approval, organizations that include notice of the CPE effort in their publications--all these represent sponsorship.

The potential for CPE as a new university function is there but, as Stern noted, it is a disorderly market. Framing the activity around departments supported by an all-university unit offers one path to order.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. and Schon, D. (1978) Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1974). Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Anderson, G. L. (1976). Organizational diversity. In Smart & Montgomery Examining departmental management.

Apps, Jerold W. (1985). Improving practice in continuing education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Bennett, J. (1983). Managing the academic department: Cases and notes. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Berlin, Lawrence S. (1983). The university and continuing professional education: A contrary view. In Stern, Power and conflict in continuing education.

Bresser, R. K. (1984) The context of university departments: Differences between fields of higher and lower levels of paradigm development. Research in higher education, 20, 1, pp.3-15.

Chernoff, R.; Smutz, W.D.; Lindsay, C.A.; and Kris-Etherton, P.M. (1983). Continuing education needs assessment and program development: An alternate approach, Journal of the american dietetic association, Vol. 83, No.6 (December): pp. 649-653.

Clark, Burton R. (1958). The marginality of adult education notes and essays on education for adults, Number 20. Brookline, MA: Center for the Study of Liberal Education (ERIC Document Number ED 047 284.)

Clark, T.N. (1968). Institutionalization of innovation in higher education: Four conceptual models. Administrative science quarterly, 13, 1, pp.1-25.

Crowe, M.B.; Grogan, J.; Jacobs, R.; Lindsay, C.A.; and Mark, M.M. (1985). Delineation of the roles of clinical psychology: A survey of practice in Pennsylvania. Professional psychology: Research and practice, Vol. 16, No. 1: pp. 124-137.

Dressel, P. L., & Faricy, W. H. (1972). Return to responsibility. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Dressel, P. L., Johnson, F. C., & Marcus, P. M. (1971). The confidence crisis: An analysis of university departments. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Dressel, P.L., and Reichard, D.J. (1970). The university department: Retrospect and prospect. Journal of higher education, 41 (May), pp.387-402.

Dressel, P. L., & Simon, L. A. (1976). Allocating resources among departments. In New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 11. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Engelbret, W.G. (1983). Continuing professional education: A new frontier, Pennsylvania CPA journal. Vol. 54, No. 2 (Summer): pp. 7-9.

Etzioni, Amitai. (1969). The semi-professions and their organizations. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Frandson, P. E. In Stern, Power and conflict in continuing education.

Houle, C. O. (1983). Possible futures. In Stern, Power and conflict in continuing education.

Houle, C. O. (1981). Continuing learning in the professions. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Ikenberry, S.O., and Friedman, R.C. (1972). Beyond academic departments: The study of institutes and centers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lindsay, C.A.; Crowe, M.B.; and Smutz, WD. (1983). The continuing professional education development project for clinical psychology: A collaborative process for enhancing professionalism, Professional practice of psychology, Vol. 4, No.1 (January): pp. 1-8.

Lindsay, C.A.; Queeney, D.S.; and Smutz, W.D. (1981) A model and process for university/professional association collaboration. University Park, PA.

McHenry, D.E. (1977). Academic departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, M. (1976). The academic department: Perspectives from theory and research. In Smart & Montgomery, Examining departmental management, New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 10. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Queeney, D.S. (1984). The role of the university in continuing professional education. Educational record, Vol. 65, No. 3 (Summer): pp. 13-17.

Queeney, D.S.; Hanniford, B.E.; and Dunn, P.P. (1984) Professional and occupational practice requirements: A continuing professional education service. Third edition. University Park, PA.

Smart, J. C., & Elton, C. F. (1976). Administrative roles of department chairmen. In Smart & Montgomery, Examining departmental management, New Directions for Institutional Research, Number 10. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc. Publishers.

Smutz, W.D. (1984). Formal boundary spanners and organizational change: Establishing university/professional association interorganization relationships. Ph.D. Dissertation in Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University.

Smutz, W.D.; Crowe, M.B; and Lindsay, C.A. Emerging perspectives in continuing professional education. In Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 2. Smart, John C. (Ed.). New York: Agathon Press.

Smutz, W. D.; Davis, D.M.; Lindsay, C. A. (1982). Enhancing professionalism through collaboration for continuing professional education: A role for the university. Lifelong learning research conference proceedings, pp. 215-219.

Starr, Paul. (1982). The social transformation of American medicine. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Stern, Milton R. (1983). Power and conflict in continuing education. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Toombs, W. E.; Lindsay, C.A.; and Hettinger, G. (1985). Modifying faculty roles to institutionalize continuing professional education, Research in higher education, Vol. 22, No.1: pp. 93-109.

Toombs, W.E. and Lindsay, C.A. (1985). Continuing education for professionals: A practice oriented approach. The Journal of continuing higher education, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Winter).

Tucker, A. (1981) Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Woll, Bruce. (1984). The empty ideal: A critique of continuing learning in the professions. In Houle, Adult education quarterly, 34:3.